

ANSWERING REVIEWERS



December 2nd 2013

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 5872-review.doc).

Title: An update on nutritional status, body composition and growth in paediatric Inflammatory Bowel Disease

Author: Rebecca Joanne Hill

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 5872

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Headings have been amended as per editor's comments.

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

(1) Reviewer 00055041: This is an interesting paper. The results are clear and well described.

Response: *None required.*

(2) Reviewer 00029041: This paper is well written. Minor revision needed.

Comment: Did the author use PubMed search? What were the key words? Please describe.

Response: *Search engine and search terms have been included as per reviewer's comments.*

(3) Reviewer 02520738: We have read through the manuscript and we think that it is a well-written manuscript. Nevertheless, minor changes should be performed.

Comment 1: Although this is not a systematic review the manuscript should be better organized.

a. What kind of database did the authors use?

Response: *see response to reviewer (2).*

b. Which were the keywords adopted?

Response: *see response to reviewer (2).*

c. How many articles studies did they find? d. What inclusion/exclusion criteria did they adopt in order to consider or not a literature study in their research? e. How many articles did they exclude?

Response to c, d, and e: *As recognized by the reviewer, this manuscript is not a systematic review. This manuscript is a topic highlight giving a consensus view of the literature. I believe it would be redundant and inappropriate to include information such as flow chart of the literature search as you would a systematic review. The literature was not searched and reviewed in the manner of a systematic review. As this review was not initially conducted as a systematic review, these data would now need to be compiled retrospectively, which I believe is inappropriate.*

Comment 2: A flow chart resembling the main steps of evaluation of literature background, inclusion/exclusion criteria, number of studies considered/excluded, should be provided.

Response: *As per response to comment 1c, d, and e.*

Comment 3: A table gathering all the main characteristics of the studies considered, their outcomes, their results, etc should be provided in order to easily recognize the features of the present works.

Response: *A summary table (Table 1) has been added.*

Comment 4. The author should better consider the limitation of the studies considered. Within

biologics section, she should better revise the studies considered, the limited number of patients that entered the studies and the limited results coming from such researchers. Please comment about.

Response: The addition of Table 1, as per comment 3 from this reviewer, serves as further discussion and revision of the studies considered. Further, a comment has been included in the conclusion section as follows: "Data are promising with respect to improvements in linear growth as a result of treatment with biologics, however, it is clear that further research is necessary in this area as the majority of studies conducted are retrospective in nature and subject numbers are small."

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,



Rebecca Joanne HILL PhD
Children's Nutrition Research Centre
Queensland Children's Medical Research Institute
The University of Queensland
Herston QLD 4029
Australia
Phone: +61-7-3365-5351
Fax: +61-7-3346-4684
E-mail: rj.hill@uq.edu.au